



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/869,259	11/28/2001	Jerry Moscovitch	500500008USB	2432
54984 7590 08/10/2009 MASS ENGINEERED DESIGN INC. 474 WELLINGTON STREET WEST TORONTO, ON M5V-1E3 CANADA				
EXAMINER SHAPIRO, LEONID				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/10/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/869,259

Applicant(s)

MOSCOVITCH ET AL.

Examiner

Leonid Shapiro

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5,9,11-14 and 20-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5,9,11-14 and 20-24 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moscovitch (5,687,939).

As to claim 25, Moscovitch teaches a system for supporting a first display panel and a second display panel (fig. 13, items 106,108), the system comprising:

a base (fig. 13, item 102);

a column connected to the base (fig. 13, item 122);

a first support arm connected to the column, said first support arm having a first mounting assembly for mounting the first display panel thereto (fig. 13, items 108,110,132,134); and a second support arm connected to and extendable from the first support arm (fig. 13, items 106,112,122,126), the second support arm having a second mounting assembly for mounting the second display panel thereto, wherein the second support arm includes a mechanism, that allows the second display panel to face away from the first display panel (in reference – limited tilting) (col. 5, lines 50-52).

Moscovitch does not disclose a hinge.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace tilting mechanism for hinge in order to provide convenient positioning of dual displays (col. 1, lines 4-6 in the Moscovitch reference).

As to claim 26, Moscovitch teaches the second support arm telescopes relative to the first support arm (figs. 1-6, item 18, col. 3, lines 12-20).

As to claim 27,29, Moscovitch teaches the column and the first support arm are substantially vertical when the base rests on a horizontal surface, further comprising the first display panel and the second display panel (fig. 13, items 102,106,108,122,col. 5, lines 50-52).

As to claim 28, Moscovitch teaches the hinge and the second support arm allow the first display panel and the second display panel to be tilting together facing each other (fig. 13, items 106,112,122,126, col. 5, lines 50-52).

Moscovitch does not disclose folding together.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace facing with folding in order to provide convenient positioning of dual displays (col. 1, lines 4-6 in the Moscovitch reference).

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 5,9,11-14,20-24 are allowed.

Relative to claim 5 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Moscovitch) and the instant invention is that the second image is viewable by a first person viewing the first image and a second operating position in which the second image is viewable by a second person opposite the first person viewing the first image, wherein at least one of the ends is extendable between a retracted configuration and an

extended configuration, thereby varying the distance between the first and second computer displays.

Claims 9,11-14,20-24 depend on claim 5.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Telephone inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 571-272-7683. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

08/09/09
/L. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Richard Hjerpe/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629